

June 1, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11763

TABLE 7.—Education and Experience—Continued
JOB VACANCIES BY MINIMUM EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

	Years of schooling required									Total	Standard error of total number of job vacancies
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
Horizontal percent distribution											
Minimum period of related experience:											
Less than 1 year: None.....	4.6	6.8	6.0	11.3	28.9	9.3	29.4	1.4	2.3	100.0	-----
1 to 3 months.....	12.2	0	17.3	28.1	37.4	2.9	2.2	0	0	100.0	-----
4 to 6 months.....	37.8	3.2	11.2	10.8	20.3	15.9	.8	0	0	100.0	-----
7 to 11 months.....	0	0	2.2	56.5	40.2	0	1.1	0	0	100.0	-----
1 year.....	0	15.1	4.6	5.5	52.2	11.9	4.2	.2	6.3	100.0	-----
2 years.....	.3	7.2	5.1	37.6	30.8	5.7	11.2	2.0	.1	100.0	-----
3 years.....	0	27.1	20.6	3.4	22.0	3.7	18.9	2.8	1.4	100.0	-----
4 years.....	0	0	51.5	4.2	28.9	1.0	8.7	3.0	2.7	100.0	-----
5 years.....	0	22.7	1.4	7.9	31.6	9.6	22.0	3.1	1.7	100.0	-----
6 years.....										(1)	-----
7 to 9 years.....										(2)	-----
10 years or more.....										(3)	-----
Total.....	4.2	7.8	11.1	13.5	30.2	7.9	21.2	1.6	2.3	100.0	-----
Vertical percent distribution											
Minimum period of related experience:											
Less than 1 year: None.....	62.9	49.6	31.0	48.0	55.1	67.2	79.9	50.8	59.3	57.6	-----
1 to 3 months.....	5.0	0	2.7	3.6	2.2	.6	.2	0	0	1.7	-----
4 to 6 months.....	28.2	1.3	3.1	2.5	2.1	6.3	.1	0	0	3.1	-----
7 to 11 months.....	0	0	.2	4.8	1.5	0	.1	0	0	1.2	-----
1 year.....	0	12.6	2.7	2.7	11.3	9.8	1.3	.8	18.1	6.5	-----
2 years.....	.9	10.4	5.2	31.3	11.5	8.0	6.0	13.8	.5	11.3	-----
3 years.....	0	15.3	8.2	1.1	3.2	2.1	4.0	7.7	2.7	4.4	-----
4 years.....	0	0	30.4	2.0	6.3	.8	2.7	12.3	7.7	6.6	-----
5 years.....	0	10.5	.4	2.1	3.8	4.4	3.8	6.9	2.7	3.6	-----
6 years.....	0	.3	16.0	1.0	1.7	0	.7	1.5	0	2.6	-----
7 to 9 years.....	3.0	0	0	.7	1.0	.3	.9	4.6	4.4	.9	-----
10 years or more.....	0	0	0	0	.4	.5	.4	1.5	4.4	.4	-----
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-----

1 Statistically unreliable owing to large relative size of standard error.

2 Distribution statistically unreliable owing to small number of reported vacancies.

NOTE.—(1) Data in all tables relate to Monroe County, N.Y. and to Feb. 12, 1965.

(2) Components do not necessarily add to totals owing to rounding.

(3) Unless otherwise stated, the source for all tables is the NICB survey. (See text.)

(4) All standard errors are rounded to 3 significant digits.

The sample for the NICB February survey was designed to obtain reliable information from employers of all sizes and in all major industry groups. Nine different size groups (in terms of employment) were used in the sample design. In addition, 10 different industry divisions were separately sampled. All employers with 250 or more employees were included in the sample. Of 416 employers chosen, 10 were found to be out of business on the survey date, 8 were seasonally closed, 3 refused to provide information, and 1, a very small employer, could not be contacted by an interviewer. Substitutions were made for two of the refusals, in medium-sized firms. Of those employers available to respond, 99 percent did so. Of those responding, 48 percent reported one or more job vacancies.

The interviews were carried out by six members of the staff of the conference board and eight employees of Bernardine Slade Market Research, Inc. Prior to the February survey a number of extensive exploratory interviews were conducted with Rochester employers. A pretest of 45 small- and medium-sized employers was conducted in January. Also, a conference board employee conducted a postenumeration quality check after the February survey of 14 employers previously interviewed.

Our experience with these surveys has led us to the tentative conclusion that the collection of job vacancy statistics is a feasible operation when the information is obtained by interview and the groundwork in the community has been carefully prepared. Employers were cooperative in almost all cases and readily understood the concepts and definitions. A preliminary analysis of the results indicates that they are reasonable and consistent with other information. Our final judgment, however, must wait upon the results of the two additional sample sur-

veys in Monroe County, one in May and the other in August 1965.

JOHN G. MYERS,
Senior Economist, Special Projects,
Office of the Chief Economist.

AMERICAN PUBLIC PATIENCE BIG REQUIREMENT FOR SUCCESS IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Edward T. Foillard, a columnist for the Washington Post, has written a thoughtful and, wise article on the great importance of patience and stamina on the part of the American public with regard to Vietnam. He says, in part:

The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons, and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States. In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATIENCE, STAMINA: VIETNAM REQUIREMENTS
(By Edward T. Foillard)

The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States. In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of

these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

It is a fact that Americans are not noted for patience. Indeed, we have made a virtue of impatience, and this doubtless has had much to do with the Nation's greatness. Ours is a country in a hurry, as is exemplified in the slogan:

"The difficult we do immediately. The impossible takes a little longer."

This is admirable, but what happens if the war in Vietnam is a long drawn out one? It could become the longest war in which the United States has ever engaged. It certainly will become that if Donald Johnson, national commander of the American Legion, is right. The Legion chief, who recently visited South Vietnam, said at the White House last week that he could envision the struggle going on for another 5, 6 or 7 years.

American intervention in South Vietnam began in the Eisenhower administration, but the current buildup in manpower was ordered by President Kennedy, and the first American casualties were reported late in 1961. Therefore, if the fighting should continue for another 5 years, it would set a record for American involvement with a foreign foe, exceeding in duration the Revolutionary War (1775-83).

President Johnson is eager for a settlement in Vietnam, but he has vowed to hang on there until the Reds of North Vietnam and their Vietcong allies end their aggression against South Vietnam. He says that the United States will "not be defeated" and will "not grow tired." Moreover, the Texan believes that his successor, or successors, will if necessary carry on the struggle after he leaves the White House.

That still leaves unanswered the question of how the American people would behave if the conflict is prolonged. It is an important question. In writing about the Korean war

June 1, 1965

in volume II of his memoirs, former President Harry S. Truman said:

"What a nation can do or must do begins with the willingness of its people to shoulder the burden."

The American people saw the Korean war through, but their patience was badly strained. There were hawks and doves then, too. But in between were millions of Americans who just weren't persuaded that this Nation's involvement was worth the cost in lives and treasure.

Sir Winston Churchill said later that this one act by Mr. Truman—his boldness and swiftness in going into Korea—entitled him to be listed among America's great Presidents. It seemed at this time, however, that the Missourian never quite succeeded in explaining to the mass of his countrymen what was at stake in Korea, and he was jeered for calling the war "a police action."

President Truman had strong backing when he first sent American troops to Korea under the banner of the United Nations. But as the conflict dragged on, it became a political issue at home, and Senator Robert A. Taft and other Republicans began calling it "Truman's war."

In spite of this division, which carried over into the 1952 presidential campaign, the Communists realized after a year of fighting that the map of Korea couldn't be changed by violence. After a signal from Moscow and Peiping, negotiations for a truce began on July 10, 1951. The negotiations continued for 2 years; finally, the armistice agreement was signed at Panmunjon on July 27, 1953.

Back in the spring of 1951, President Truman had fired Gen. Douglas MacArthur as Far East commander. He disagreed with MacArthur's proposal to attack Red China and he disagreed with MacArthur's shibboleth: "There is no substitute for victory."

"The only victory we seek," said Mr. Truman, "is the victory of peace." But in saying this, he insisted that the Communists would not be allowed "to keep the fruits of their misdeeds." And so the war ended where it began.

The war in Vietnam is very much different from Korea. President Johnson's objective, however, is much the same as Mr. Truman's: to show the Communists that they can't get away with aggression against their neighbor.

Mr. Johnson has said that the United States has no desire to conquer North Vietnam and that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." Barring a change in policy, this would seem to leave the United States with only one course of action: to hang on until the Communists decide, as they did in Korea, that fighting is no longer profitable.

The Communist leaders of Hanoi and Peiping, as has been said, are betting that Americans don't have the staying power to go the route. A generation ago, Hitler and Mussolini were saying that the United States was "decadent."

PR L.B.J. IN SANTO DOMINGO NOT TOO LITTLE OR TOO LATE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 30, Eric Sevareid discussed the Santo Domingo situation. He said, in part:

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor, and a safety factor with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste. Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "Too little with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "Too soon with too much."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOMINGO REDS NEVER A MYTH

(By Eric Sevareid)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—The tide of second guessing about the American intervention in Santo Domingo—as to its justification, its size, its methods and its aims—had reached oceanic proportions by the time this writer managed to get to the first European city established in the New World. Here in what Columbus called "the land of God," had come the first teachers and preachers, yet here remains, after five centuries, one of the political hellholes of the hemisphere, its sordid streets once again thronged with armed men from abroad.

The scenes of bitter sorrow in Santo Domingo have been well described; there are other things, perhaps, worth putting down at this late date. I thought I had rarely seen such brave work by combat reporters, rarely such emotional involvement on the part of some of them, rarely such a wealth of unconfirmable reports and rumors, rarely such a disastrous lack of contact between reporters and American officials who were not only physically remote but for a long time silenced by Presidential orders. And rarely have I read such certain conclusions in American press editorials about a phenomenon in which so much was uncertain and inconclusive.

For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth, impossible to believe that a democratic and stable government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful bloodletting in the congested downtown region.

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor and a safety factor with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste. Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "too late with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "too soon with too much." I fail to understand the editorialist who points out with disdain that after all, there were only a few handfuls of Communists present. In a very real sense their lack of numbers is their strength. It was because they were few that former President Juan Bosch had not bothered to deal severely with them. It was because they were few that they could do much of their work undetected. It was because they were few that foreign opinionmakers could make the Americans seem ridiculous and give us a propaganda defeat. As former Ambassador John Bartlow Martin reminds us, Communists do not make revolutions, they take them over.

And their small number in various other Latin American countries lies near the heart of the profound dilemma that confronts the United States for the future. Revolts are brewing in other nations to the south. In all these revolts Communist elements will be present. Are we to put down every uprising because a Communist threat is present? Obviously we cannot, even though some of these uprisings probably will produce Communist governments.

But nothing in this realm of human action is inevitable; the game is not lost as long as

we act on the assumption that it can be won. There are Latin societies strong enough to handle the Communists. Others will be galvanized into counteraction by Communist victories or near victories close by their borders.

Meantime, the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary, while communism is permanent.

It is nonsense to indulge any longer the self-conscious idea that Latin America's troubles are the fault of the United States. Some are; most are the fault of Latin America. Its ways of life are superior to ours in more than a few respects, but not in respect to the art of government. In the last century and a half there have been in all of Latin America approximately 3,700 coups, rebellions, and civil wars.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the May 28, 1965, issue of the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., entitled "Justice Action on Baker Overdue."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE ACTION ON BAKER OVERDUE

Well over a year ago, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, had urged continued Senate investigation of Robert G. Baker, former secretary to the Senate Democrats. He wanted the Senate to be free of criticism that "someone high in the Government" was being protected.

Senator WILLIAMS also noted then that it was time for the Department of Justice to begin criminal prosecution in the Baker case.

Earlier in 1964 the head of the Justice Department's criminal division had said his office was conducting an important investigation into Baker's affairs "to ascertain the possibility of false statements, conflict of interest, bribery, fraud against the Government and conspiracy."

Then late last year it was revealed that a Federal grand jury in the national capital had started an investigation of conflict of interest and other charges against Baker.

The onetime protege of Lyndon B. Johnson had refused, under 5th amendment protections, to testify and to provide requested information before the Senate Rules Committee. His refusal was legally proper because of the possibility of court action against him.

The whole series of revelations—still far from complete—came after a civil suit had been filed against Baker in September of 1963, a suit charging that he had used political influence in the award of contracts in defense plants for a vending machine firm. Since then there have been out of court negotiations for settlement of this case.

It is no wonder now that Senator WILLIAMS is concerned over a pending summary report from the Senate Rules Committee. From unofficial leaks, he has come to the belief that a desperate effort is being made to discredit him while the committee's majority Democrats and the Johnson administration are trying "to save Baker from legal prosecution at all costs."

June 1, 1965

like reapportionment. "The unequal distribution of representation is not just," he said in April of 1963. "About 40 percent of the people are running the legislature."

Mr. Sam saw the legislature plain ("Often you could set trees in the chairs and get the same results") but he suggested as well as criticized: "There's nothing more sacred than lawmaking. We should be more deliberate about our legislation—not legislate on the spur of the moment."

Sam Levine pursued even the most important things, like justice and enlightenment, with tranquility.

He was strong and of good courage. He trained his courage not to defy, but to preserve law and reason.

When men want to know the reason for America's strength at its grassroots, let them study the life of Sam M. Levine in Pine Bluff, Ark.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S WISE POLICY IN THE DOMINICAN RE- PUBLIC IS SUCCEEDING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Friday, President Johnson delivered an important address on the occasion of his receiving an honorary degree from Baylor University, at Waco, Tex.

He devoted the address to a presentation of his administration's policy and position in the Dominican Republic. It is a position which I have vigorously supported from the beginning.

The charge that is being made at home and abroad—that our landing of Marine in the Dominican Republic was a relapse into, and a resumption of, our "gunboat diplomacy" of the early days of this century—is, in my view, wholly without foundation.

As one who, as a journalist, as managing editor of the Nation from 1920 to 1923, fought against this manifestation of U.S. imperialism, I believe I am qualified to point out that our action in the Dominican Republic is in no sense a recrudescence of the discredited policies that were followed from the late eighteen nineties until President Franklin D. Roosevelt's enunciation of the good-neighbor policy. It was at President Roosevelt's first venture into Latin American affairs, at the Seventh Inter-American Conference, at Montevideo, in the late fall of 1933, that a foundation was laid for a policy of nonintervention. Secretary of State Cordell Hull headed the delegation. I had been appointed as its advisor.

The interventions into Latin American countries prior to that time, the sending of our Marines into Nicaragua, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, were motivated by American economic interests. Our occupations of these three countries were designed to safeguard the investments of American private interests. It was a policy wholly inconsistent with our national professions, and wholly at variance with Woodrow Wilson's pronouncements for self-determination of small nations, although it was in the Wilson administration that this regrettable policy was most vigorously carried out.

President Johnson's action in the Dominican Republic was motivated first by the desire to save the lives of Americans and other nationals; and, as he pointed out in his Baylor address, that was car-

ried out without the loss of a single life among those who were evacuated. Second, his purpose was to forestall a Castro-Communist takeover and to obviate the falling behind the Iron Curtain of a second nation in the Caribbean. Third, President Johnson wanted to establish a multilateral approach to all future situations of that kind, and to enlist the Organization of American States in that worthwhile objective. It is being done. A month after the first landing of our Marines, there withdrawal has begun. It may require some time to withdraw all except those needed as a part of an inter-American peacekeeping police force but the objective has been made clear, and the process is underway.

If successful, as all of us hope it will be, it will prove to be an epochmaking event in inter-American relations. I have so stated as my view from the beginning, and I now reassert it.

Inasmuch as President Johnson, admirably summed up the whole matter, I ask unanimous consent that his speech at Baylor be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 29, 1965]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS AT BAYLOR

This is a moment that I deeply wish my parents could have lived to share. In the first place, my father would have enjoyed what you have so generously said of me and my mother would have believed it.

More than that, the honor you pay me is in a real sense honor that's due my mother. All of her life she spoke often of Baylor, a trait that I have found not uncommon among all of your alumni.

Her pride in Baylor and being the granddaughter of a president of Baylor, passed on to me early and influenced the course of my own life more constructively than I could ever describe.

So I am most grateful to you for this moment and for its meaning to me.

Woodrow Wilson once told the men of Princeton that it is not learning but the spirit of service that will give a college place in the public annals of the Nation.

For 120 years, Baylor University has touched the lives of many generations with an unusual spirit of selfless service. That spirit expressed in the work of ministers and missionaries, of public servants and public school teachers, of devout parents and dedicated citizens has not only won for Baylor a place of esteem in this State and this Nation, it has served the betterment of the condition of man to the remote ends of this earth.

HISTORIC HOUR FOR NATION

On this occasion, we meet here today at a historic hour in the life of the American nation.

In Washington, leaders of this hemisphere are meeting to work together to open a road to durable peace in the Dominican Republic.

Their efforts will have our full support, for at stake is the future not only of one of our sister republics but the principles and the values of all the American Republics.

We are members of an inter-American system in which large and small nations are partners in the defense of freedom and in the progress of economic welfare and social justice.

That partnership must be constantly strengthened. Our common aim and our combined ability must increase in crisis as well as in calm.

The tragedy of the past 4 weeks in the Dominican Republic renews our common resolution to accept common responsibility in dealing with common dangers.

In that unfortunate nation 4 weeks ago the legacy of dictatorship exploded in fury and anarchy. Hundreds of Dominicans died, leaving thousands of widows and orphans of war. Nineteen of our own American boys lost their lives. The capital city, birthplace of the Western Hemisphere, was split asunder.

Blood and hate drowned ideals. And for days freedom itself stood on the edge of disaster.

BOLIVAR ADMONITION RECALLED

In those early terrible hours we did what we had to do, remembering Simon Bolivar's admonition that "to hesitate is destruction." As your President, I did what I had to do.

Since then, working with the Organization of American States and its distinguished Secretary General, José Mora, the forces of democracy have acted. The results are clear.

More than 6,500 men and women and children from 46 different countries have been evacuated and not a single life was lost; a cease-fire was achieved, bringing an end to the threat of wholesale bloodshed; an international zone of refuge was opened as a haven for all men of peace and a safe corridor 17 miles long was established by American men.

More than 8 million pounds of food have been distributed to the Dominican people; a well-trained, disciplined band of Communists was prevented from destroying the hopes of Dominican democracy; political avenues were opened to help the Dominican people find a Dominican solution to their problems.

Today those achievements are guaranteed—guaranteed by the troops of five nations, representing this hemisphere. They are under the command of the able Brazilian general, General [Hugo Panasco] Alvin, and for the first time in the history of the Organization of American States [it] has created and it has sent to the soil of an American nation an international peacekeeping military force.

That may be the greatest achievement of all.

The United States made its forces a part of that inter-American force and as the contributions of the Latin American nations have been incorporated into the OAS force in the last 2 days, the United States have removed 1,600 troops from the island. I am issuing orders this morning to remove an additional 1,700 men on Saturday.

I have also instructed our commanding General [Bruce] Palmer [Jr.] to discuss possible further withdrawals with General Alvin and such action will be taken when the military commanders believe it is safe and warranted by the arrival of other Latin American forces or by the continued stabilization of the military situation.

So now we ask ourselves this morning what is next.

The answer to that question rests partly with the people of the Dominican Republic, and partly with their neighbors throughout this hemisphere. Already under the distinguished leadership of Secretary General Mora the broad outlines of a reasonable settlement are beginning to emerge, outlines which meet the need and respond to the desires, first of the Dominican people themselves and then of all the people of this hemisphere.

First, the Dominican people and the people of their sister republics do not want government by extremists of either the left or the right, and that is clear. They want to be ruled neither by an old conspiracy of reaction and tyranny nor by a new conspiracy of Communist violence.

Second, they want, as we do, an end to slaughter in the streets and to brutality in the barrios.

June 1, 1965

Third, they want, as we do, food and work and quiet in the night.

Fourth, they want, as we do, a constitutional government that will represent them all and work for all their hopes.

Fifth, the Dominican people know they need the help of sympathetic neighbors in healing their wounds and negotiating their divisions. But what they want ultimately is the chance to shape their own course. Those are the hopes of the Dominican people. But they are our hopes, too, and they are shared by responsible people in every nation of this hemisphere.

STRONGER SHIELD SOUGHT

Out of the Dominican crucible the 20 American nations must now forge a stronger shield against disaster. The opportunity is here now for a new thrust forward to show the world the way to true international cooperation in the cause of peace and in the struggle to win a better life for all of us.

We believe that the new world may most wisely approach this task guided by new realities.

The first reality is that old concepts and old labels are largely obsolete.

In today's world with the enemies of freedom talking about wars of national liberation the old distinction between the civil war and international war has already lost much of its meaning.

Second is the reality that when forces of freedom move slowly, whether on political or economic or military fronts, the forces of slavery and subversion move rapidly and they move rapidly and they move decisively.

Third, we know that when a Communist group seeks to exploit misery the entire free American system is put in deadly danger. We also know that these dangers can be found today in many of our lands.

FURTHER ATTEMPTS EXPECTED

There is no trouble anywhere these evil forces will not try to turn to their advantage and we can expect more efforts at triumph by terror and conquest through chaos.

Fourth, we have learned in the Dominican Republic that we can act decisively and we can act together.

Fifth, it is clear that we need new international machinery geared to meet the fast-moving events. When hours can decide the fate of generations, the moment of decision must become the moment of action.

And just as these lessons the past 4 weeks are clear, so are the basic principles which have guided the purpose of the United States of America.

We seek no territory. We do not seek to impose our will on anyone. We intend to work for the self-determination of the peoples of the Americas within the framework of freedom.

In times past, large nations have used their power to impose their will on smaller nations. Today, we have placed our forces at the disposition of the nations of this hemisphere to assure the peoples of those nations the right to exercise their own will in freedom.

RESOLUTION CITED

And in accordance with the resolution of the eighth meeting of the ministers at Punta Del Este, Uruguay, we will join with other OAS nations in opposing a Communist takeover in this hemisphere.

And in accordance with the Charter of Punta del Este, we will join with other OAS nations in pressing for change among those who would maintain a feudal system—a feudal system that denies social justice and economic progress to the ordinary peoples of this hemisphere.

We want for the peoples of this hemisphere only what they want for themselves: Liberty, justice, dignity, a better life for all.

More than a few agitators was necessary to bring on the tragic and the cruel bloodshed in the Dominican Republic. They needed additional help and a deeper cause, and they had both.

For the roots of the trouble are found wherever the landless and the despised, the poor and the oppressed stand before the gates of opportunity seeking entry into a brighter land; they can get there only if we narrow the gap between the rich nations and the poor, and between the rich and the poor within each nation.

And this is the heart of the purpose of the United States. Here on the campus of Baylor University we will reaffirm that purpose on June 26 when almost 50 Peace Corps volunteers will begin training for service in the Dominican Republic.

These young men and women will go to the barrios of Santo Domingo and Santiago to work with and to work for the people of the Dominican Republic in attaining a new life and a new hope.

At home, with the strong cooperation of our Congress, we are waging war on poverty; we are opening new paths of learning for all of our children; we are creating new jobs for our workers; we are providing health care for our older citizens; we are eliminating injustice and inequality; we are bringing new economic life to whole regions.

These objectives we will continue to pursue with all of our strength and all of our determination.

As peace returns to the Dominican people and as a broad base is laid for a new Dominican Government responsive to the people's will, the United States will be prepared to join in full measure in the massive task of reconstruction and in the hopeful work of lasting economic progress.

For, in bold ink, our signature is on the charter of the alliance. That charter commands a peaceful, democratic social revolution across the hemisphere. It asks that unjust privilege be ended and that unfair power be curbed.

A PLEA TO OPEN GATES

It asks that we help throw open the gates of opportunity to these millions who stand there now knocking. And just as we have joined in the Dominican Republic to bring peace to a troubled world, we have joined with these forces across the hemisphere who seek to advance their own independence and their own democratic progress.

We work with and for those men and women not because we have to. We work because morality commands it and justice requires it and our own dignity as men depends upon it.

We work not because we fear the unjust wrath of our enemy but because we fear the just wrath of God.

In Santo Domingo the last month has been grim. The storm there is not yet over. But a new sense of hope is beginning. And across the angry arguments of the opposing forces, the voice of good sense is now beginning to be heard.

As the Organization of American States recommit itself to the hard efforts of peace-making, the Government and the people of the United States proudly pledge full support to the peacemakers.

The path ahead is long. The way ahead is hard. So we must, in the words of the Prophet, "mount up on the wings of eagles, run and not grow weary."

Thank you.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, two editorials on this general subject, but dealing especially with the responsibilities and functions of the OAS. The editorials were published in

the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 17 and the San Jose, Calif., Mercury of May 5, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, May 17, 1965]

OAS SHOULD TAKE FIRM HAND

In the Dominican crisis the Organization of American States has an excellent and unprecedented opportunity to demonstrate its capabilities as an effective instrument for peace, in the Western Hemisphere.

Thus far, the OAS performance has been somewhat disappointing.

The cease-fire is not being enforced. Rival factions in the Dominican Republic continue their struggle for power by force of arms. The OAS Peace Commission is slow in exercising authority and making its presence felt in Santo Domingo.

We urge the OAS to be firm. The Organization has the power to end the Dominican chaos by negotiation and persuasion, backed up by whatever police force is necessary. Not only U.S. troops but armed units of several Latin American countries are on the scene.

It is easy to argue in theory that the United States should have kept hands off the Dominican turmoil and should have let the OAS bear the full weight of responsibility right at the outset. The fact is, however, that the OAS has not been very impressive since it was given the authority and support to take decisive action. The OAS is carrying the ball now and should show what it can do.

Most Americans assuredly share President Johnson's hope, expressed in a statement over the weekend, "that the OAS mission presently in the Dominican Republic will rapidly find a solution that will at the same time assure for the Dominican people the principles of a democratic constitution and a government of national unity able to maintain economic and political stability."

It should be noted, in fairness to the OAS and as some measure of explanation for its difficulty in taking hold of things, that the United Nations is compounding the Dominican troubles. Untimely arrival of the U.N. investigation team in Santo Domingo—headed by an Army officer from India, of all places—serves only to add to the confusion.

The U.N. ought to be encouraging international settlement of disputes by appropriate regional organizations, such as the OAS, instead of intruding undiplomatically and flexing its own muscles.

As we understand it, the Organization of American States is supposed to be in charge in the Dominican Republic. That's the way it ought to be. The OAS should be a little less timid and substantially more positive in getting a firm grip on the situation.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury, May 5, 1965]

TIME TO TURN POLICY INTO ACTION

The responsibility for the future of the Dominican Republic is now firmly affixed to the Organization of American States. This is as it should be.

President Johnson made this point quite clear Monday when he said American troops would be withdrawn as soon as the OAS could guarantee that a Communist government would not be set up in Santo Domingo. As the President observed:

"The moment that the Organization of American States can present a plan that will bring peace on the island and give us the opportunity to evacuate our people and give some hope of stability of government, we'll be the first to come back home. . . . We don't intend to sit here in our rock-

June 1, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11699

ing chair with our hands folded and let the Communists set up any government in the Western Hemisphere. * * *

Cuba is one Communist government too many in the Western Hemisphere. Had the United States acted in timely fashion in Cuba, the pervading threat of Castro communism would not now hang over the Caribbean. The least this country can do now is to insure that the policy of containment actually works.

In principle, the OAS has subscribed to that policy. Now it is time for the OAS to translate policy into action.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President at the annual convention of the Order of Lafayette held recently in Washington, the members of this widely recognized patriotic society unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Whereas the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives has for 30 years courageously, efficiently and effectively investigated Communist activities in all its various ramifications throughout the United States, and by its constant investigations and turning the searchlight of truth upon the aims, purposes, principles and objectives of the Communist conspiracy has succeeded in warning the American people of its menace to freedom everywhere; and

Whereas the investigation of Communist and subversive activities by the Un-American Activities Committee has, to a large degree, exposed and smashed communism in the United States before it could spread as it has in France and Italy. All Communists are potential spies, traitors, saboteurs, and enemies from within: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Order of Lafayette at its convention assembled, That adequate funds be provided annually for the investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee of communism and subversive propaganda and activities in our midst, and as long as the Communist conspiracy continues to threaten our free institutions and constitutional form of Government.

"BIG BROTHER." COMPUTERS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, "big brother" is greatly assisted by automation and the whole current scientific revolution.

One small boost that automation has given to big brotherism is the new use of computers in compiling evidence for criminal prosecutions.

Mr. Sidney E. Zion has written a most interesting piece for the New York Times, entitled "Computers on Trial."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPUTERS ON TRIAL—USE IN WINNING GAMBLING INDICTMENTS ATTACKED AS VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Sidney E. Zion)

The pervasive computer swung into action this week in New York and came up with 86 alleged bookmakers.

And, as it probably expected, it also came in for some stinging criticism. Joseph P. Hoey, U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York, disclosed on Wednesday for the first time in modern criminology computers were an integral aid in uncovering book-making activities. His announcement drew quick fire from some lawyers and civil libertarians, and more is likely to come as the possible implications of the practice become clearer.

The main argument of the critics is that most people today consider computers to be infallible and that therefore the mere announcement that they were used as the basis for indictments could fatally prejudice a defendant's right to a fair trial.

The New York Civil Liberties Union yesterday expressed shock and dismay at Mr. Hoey's announcement. It charged that the announcement violated the restrictions placed on pretrial publicity by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach on April 16.

DATA ON TESTS BARRED

Among other things he restricted information regarding investigative procedures such as lie-detector tests, ballistic tests, fingerprints and laboratory tests.

The Civil Liberties Union said that the disclosure of the use of computers clearly falls within the Attorney General's proscriptions.

On this point, a legal observer pointed out yesterday that Mr. Hoey's announcement appeared to have also violated the Attorney General's rule against characterizing defendants. Mr. Hoey had singled out, by name, 4 of the 86 defendants as top-echelon bookmakers.

The Civil Liberties Union also said that significant constitutional problems would be presented if Mr. Hoey's office placed substantial reliance on the computers in obtaining the indictments.

The union said it was studying the question of whether the use of machines that make judgments can be appropriately substituted for human judgments in establishing probable cause to justify the return of indictments.

It is difficult to determine the importance computers had in the New York case.

As Mr. Hoey explained it, the computers were fed with information obtained over a 2-year period from bettors, agents, police, and other sources. This information included bookmakers' worksheets, the movements of bettors and bookmakers, geographical patterns of betting and the methods and amounts of payoffs.

Having digested all of this information, the machines then evaluated it and the indictments followed.

According to the Government's initial announcement the indictments might not have been possible without the computers. The announcement said this was because manual processing of the information would have taken so long the 3-year statute of limitations on the charges could have expired before the vital data had been obtained.

In a telephone interview on Thursday, however, Mr. Hoey said that there was sufficient human evidence before the grand jury to justify the indictments.

IMPLICATIONS DISTURBING

In any event, it is the implications of the New York case that disturb many lawyers.

"I find the whole thing revolting and nineteen eighty-fourish," said William Kunstler, a New York civil rights lawyer.

Will a computer's evaluation of a man's guilt ever be permitted into evidence at his trial?

Most lawyers questioned this week said that this evidence would not be admissible.

A few, however, had reservations, pointing out that radar evidence is generally permitted States and that computer evidence is generally permitted in civil cases where business records are records are kept on IBM cards, for example.

The principal legal objections to its use are that a computer cannot be cross-examined, although its programmer can, and that a jury would be unduly swayed by the computer's conclusions.

The last point is the one most often stressed by lawyers. It was widely expressed on Thursday by Connecticut lawyers attending the Greenwich Bar Association's Law Day ceremonies.

"Most people today are prepared to say that the computer is right," said Jack Waltuch, a Norwalk lawyer. "It can tell you where the stars are going to be a million years from now. Do you think a jury is not going to believe that it can tell you where a bookie is in the Bronx? It's just too sacrosanct and that's what scares me."

EXPANSION OF TOURISM IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article published in the Sunday Gazette-Mail—Charleston, W. Va.—State magazine on May 30, 1965. This article reports on the sixth annual travel clinic held at Blackwater Falls State Park in West Virginia this spring.

This annual travel clinic is always productive in boosting the morale of West Virginians—their pride and confidence in the future growth of tourism in the Mountain State. It also serves as a forum for emphasizing the wonderful potential of the State as the vacationland of the East Central United States, and offers an opportunity for representatives of private enterprise and public agencies to work together in planning more and better facilities for the tourist and to tell the story of the State's vacationland to an increasing number of prospects.

I spoke at the third annual travel clinic in 1962, using the opportunity to acquaint West Virginians interested in promoting tourism with the anticipated virtues of the proposed Allegheny Parkway. I stressed the vital necessity of providing major arteries of travel as a means to bring travelers to West Virginia in more economically rewarding numbers. I pointed out the tremendous appeal of the proposed Allegheny Parkway to lovers of natural beauty, for it is designed as a scenic highway through national forests and other areas in the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland.

It is my hope that my bill, S. 6, which I again introduced in this session of Congress, will receive early passage. The enactment of this measure establishing the parkway, and also authorizing connect-

11700

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 1, 1965

ing parkway roads and trails to permit greater utilization of adjacent national forests and resources, will provide a basis for concrete planning by those in attendance at the next travel clinic at Blackwater Falls State Park of means to care for the heavy volume of tourist business which is anticipated in future years as a result of the opening of this proposed Allegheny Parkway.

There being no objection, the newspaper article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

BLACKWATER TRAVEL TONIC

At Blackwater you heard a lot about white water.

Alma and Jerry Cowherd, with the help of other Hardy and Grant County residents, have for the past two Aprils mixed white water, blue skies, and red noses (from the brisk spring air) and come up with greenbacks. This magic feat was much applauded at the sixth annual travel clinic which convened April 29-30 at Blackwater Falls State Park.

A convention of travel, recreation, and publicity and promotion experts, the clinic was dedicated to the proposition that tourism in West Virginia has a future which will prove profitable, in a big way, to those who cater to the needs and whims of the anticipated tourists.

The White Water canoe races on the North Fork of the South Branch of the Potomac, examples of the sort of thing that attracts visitors to the Mountain State, were quite naturally much discussed.

As the White Water canoe races came about, in part, as a result of previous (five before this one) travel clinic discussions, it was understandable that such successful events should be viewed by veteran clinic members with paternalistic pride. The hope was that other seedling ideas, planted and nurtured at the sixth travel clinic, might later flower so successfully.

Discussions were incorporated in a format program consisting of a kickoff luncheon addressed by Mrs. Margot (it rhymes with Wells Fargo) Coley, publicity director of the Greenbrier Hotel; three sessions, devoted to the stimulation of travel in West Virginia, along with an appraisal of current travel enticements and accommodations; a Governor's banquet addressed by Gov. Hulett C. Smith; and a final address by James Gross, of Washington, D.C., executive director of the National Association of Travel Organizations.

Promoters, it may be fairly stated, are neither sociologists, historians, nor objective scientists of any stripe. They are people either selling a product or looking for a product to sell.

The product in this case was tourism in West Virginia, how it could be increased and made more profitable to the businessmen of the State. Sessions at the clinic were made up of panels of experts, some of whom complained that the State government was getting altogether too large a percentage of the tourist dollar.

Frohman Johnson, executive secretary of the Upper Monongahela Valley Association, put the matter in a nutshell. Income from the tourist industry in West Virginia, he said, was approaching \$350 million a year, the bulk of which was going into the voracious coffers of the State treasury and very little going into your tax-producing, grimy little hands.

Johnson issued an impassioned appeal to private-enterprise operators "to get off your keesters and start reaping more and more of this golden harvest."

His audience did not rise as one man. The reason was that not many business people, except for dedicated ones like the Cowherds, were present. Travel and promotion experts

on the panels were lecturing other travel and promotion experts on the floor, a fact which was recognized and deplored. The need for more business people at future clinics was stressed.

The clinics could use more people like Alma and Jerry Cowherd, owners for the past 23 years of a hostelry in Petersburg called the Hermitage. They do not merely talk. They act.

The White-Water canoe races are examples of Cowherd initiative. Also, Alma and Jerry are expanding the Hermitage, adding a new, 16-unit motor unit scheduled for occupancy in mid-September. They are risking \$120,000 (locally financed), to demonstrate their faith in the travel future of West Virginia.

Despite its critics, State government was well represented at the clinic. Present were Parks Chief Kermit McKeever; State Road Commissioner Burl Sawyers; Paul Crabtree, of the Office of Economic Development; and Lovell Greathouse and Bob Bowers, both of the West Virginia Department of Commerce.

Governor Smith was present long enough to make a banquet speech emphasizing the positive approach. He said that every Mountaineer has an obligation to see his State first hand. Find out what West Virginia has to offer, he said, then tell others about it. "The spirit of 'we will,'" he declared, "will win hands down."

Kermit McKeever, at the first clinic session, chaired by John Scherlacher, professor of recreation at West Virginia University, spoke informally of planned park improvements and additions.

"Within the next month," said the parks chief, "we hope to advertise for bids for improvements to the Cass Scenic Railroad." Now 4 miles long, the railroad will be extended several more miles to the top of Bald Knob. Outdoor recreation opportunities in this area are virtually limitless.

Work on an entirely new park, built around major waterfalls of the Tygart Valley near Grafton, will begin soon. Reconstruction of archeological sites—such as the one at Buffalo in Putnam County—is also planned.

E. M. Olliver, forest supervisor of the Monongahela National Forest, perhaps hit the nail on the head not only in this area, but for all of West Virginia, when he said:

"Like Kermit, we've got lots of plans. All we're doing is waiting for the money." It takes capital to get things done, and a lack of money, at the State or private level, has always been a hinderance in the Mountain State.

Olliver spoke of a 70-acre impoundment the Federal Government will build in Randolph County, and a 53-acre impoundment to be constructed near Richwood. There will also be improvements at Cranberry Glades, partially for the protection of the glades, and partly for the convenience of visitors.

The installation of boardwalks in Cranberry Glades, Olliver pointed out, depends on changing the governmental classification of the bogs. Now a natural area, for the use of students and scholars, the glades, to qualify for improvements such as might entice general tourists would have to be changed to a "scenic area."

It is probably worth mentioning that the only tourist attractions actually in the process of being built in West Virginia (not counting motels) are being financed either by Federal or State Governments. At least no others were mentioned at the travel clinic (a private attraction of merit near Harpers Ferry is actually being closed), unless you want to count the novel farm vacation arrangement of Mrs. Wilson Teets, of Moorefield. And it appears that Mrs. Teets is using, for the most part, facilities which were already in existence.

Mrs. Teets' farm vacation enterprise, as told by Mrs. Teets, was a travel-clinic high-

light. She spoke softly and carried a very large travel promotion pitchfork.

Mrs. Teets has built up a brisk tourist business. Out-of-State visitors remain on her three farms for family vacations of a week or longer. Mrs. Teets has developed a small but flourishing business by stressing service, courtesy, and cleanliness with a minimum of ballyhoo—methods others might follow with profit to themselves and credit to West Virginia.

Why is Mrs. Teets in business? Probably to pay her property taxes. She owns 3,000 acres in the Moorefield area.

The second session of the clinic, titled "Wayout Promotions," promised more than it delivered, in terms of earth-shaking developments. Marlane MacLane, as inconspicuous as a fire engine at a funeral, advocated liquor by the drink to lure tourists to West Virginia, as did James Hetzer, a Huntington theatrical agent whose latest effort seems to have been an oriental girlie show from Japan.

Mary Scott, now with a Charleston advertising firm, but for many years a press agent for "Honey in the Rock," did not agree. That is, she said, "I do not think that liquor by the drink is the answer to all our problems," a statement with which the strongest partisan of John Barleycorn could scarcely disagree.

Mrs. Scott further proved her intransigence by making remarks about Marlane MacLane's false eyelashes. This was in a prepared speech, largely detailing Scott's successes in promoting "Honey in the Rock." One of the first things you learn about promotion and publicity people is that they are not shy.

This year, the clinic had intended, by and large, to dispense with speeches by panel members. Answering questions from the floor was to be the primary panel function, with general discussion to follow. But speeches there were, and many of them. Although this was not altogether bad, perhaps the resolve to curb speeches in next year's clinic program might be printed in somewhat larger type.

The 1965 clinic at Blackwater Falls State Park concluded with a dinner address by Gross. His primary message was to "See the U.S.A.," a message combined with a pep talk urging his listeners to sell travel. Said he:

"Everyone selling together blends hearts and minds and spirits, as the musicians in an orchestra harmonize musical tones, to create a mighty symphony of prosperity."

It should be pointed out that the sixth annual travel clinic, and all those preceding, would not have existed without the active support of the Monongahela Power Co., which also appears to have a strong role in another supporting organization, the Upper Monongahela Valley Association.

The support of the Monongahela Power Co. has not been merely verbal, but organizational and monetary. C. Samuel Kistler, for example, recreationist for the company, is the retiring president of the travel clinic, and Frohman Johnson, of the Upper Monongahela Valley Association, its retiring secretary-treasurer.

Although it is true that such company activity is no doubt tax-deductible, and redounds in the long run to company benefit (or hopes to), it is also true that such activity benefits the community and State. This enlightened policy is a far cry from that of the utility which considers its duty done when it mails out bills and writes nasty letters to delinquent customers.

Even if the results of the travel clinics, despite their chief sponsor, are not always electrifying, you should attend next year. That is, you should if your welfare is in any way concerned with travel and tourism.